

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

COREY MATTHEW CAMPANA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,
et al.,

Defendants.

3:15-cv-00214-RCJ-WGC

ORDER

re: Doc. # 12

Before the court is a letter dated 8-3-15 received from Plaintiff Corey Campana. (Doc. #12.¹) Plaintiff's letter states with respect to his lawsuit, Case No. 3-15-cv-00214, that:

"For clarification to the court this case is dismissed w/prejudice solely to the White Pine County Defendants' which are Rick Ashby & Dan Watts. It is going forward with the remaining Defendants."

The court is confused as to the proposed "clarification" Plaintiff submits. The case history reflects that Plaintiff initiated his action on April 15, 2015, with the submission of an application to proceed in forma pauperis and a civil rights complaint. (Doc. ## 1, 1-1.) On April 27, 2015, Plaintiff sought leave to file an amended complaint. (Doc. # 3). In so doing, Plaintiff has submitted pages that he wanted the court to attach to the end of his original motion. Although granting his motion to amend, the court declined to attach documents to an original filing. Plaintiff was advised that if he wished to file an amended complaint, it must be complete in and of itself. (*Id.*)

Plaintiff chose not to file an amended complaint but instead requested the court to screen his "initial civil complaint only." (Doc. # 11.) Thus, Plaintiff's original complaint, Doc. # 1-1, was placed in line for screening in the order received.

¹ Refers to court's docket number.

1 Returning to the matter of Plaintiff's more recent letter, the court cannot understand Plaintiff's
2 statement he is dismissing "White Pine Defendants...Rick Ashby & Dan Watts." (Doc. # 12.) Neither
3 of these two individuals was named as a defendant in Plaintiff's initial complaint. (Doc. # 1-1 at 2-5.)
4 Therefore, no order can be entered dismissing individuals who were not a party in the first instance.

5 Plaintiff's letter has also brought to the court's attention an earlier letter Plaintiff submitted
6 advising that he "included an Order to show cause for an (sic) Preliminary Injunction with my complaint
7 but it looks like it was included as part of the complaint. Pg. 22-25 of 66 is a separate Motion." (Doc.
8 # 10.) The reason why "it" was included as "part of the complaint" is because that is how Plaintiff
9 submitted the document, i.e., Doc. 1-1 at pp. 22-25. The court will consider whether the verbiage in
10 Plaintiff's complaint entitled "Order to Show Cause for an (sic) Preliminary Injunction" should be treated
11 independently as a motion for a preliminary injunction when Plaintiff's complaint is screened.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 DATED: August 19, 2015.

14 
15 WILLIAM G. COBB
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28